

**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS
CO FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF
THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS**

(Report set out in Article 48, 2 (a) of Council Decision 2007/435/EC)

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of: Sweden

Date: June 30, 2010

Name, Signature (authorised representative of the Responsible Authority):

Åsa Lindh, General Director of the Swedish ESF Council

Name of the contact person:

Helena Eklund, National Coordinator
European Integration Fund
Postal address: Box 47141, SE-100 74 Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail: helena.eklund@esf.se
Phone: +46 8 579 171 33

GENERAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON EVALUATION EXPERTISE AND ON METHODOLOGY

1. Did you have recourse to an evaluation expertise to prepare this report?

Yes/ No: No

- If Yes, for what part(s) of this report?

- Please explain what kind of evaluation expertise you had recourse to:

* In-house evaluation expertise (for instance, Evaluation department of the Ministry, etc.): We have used in-house evaluation expertise from within our programme unit.

* **External evaluation expertise:** A few projects have used external evaluation for their projects and when possible these findings have been incorporated into the report.

2. Brief description of the methodology used by the evaluation expertise:

We have used in-house evaluation expertise. The methodology is analyses of the documentation since June 2007 e.g. documents and web sited from the projects; project applications; status and final reports; annual and multiannual programmes; the control and management systems; interviews with awarding body officers.

EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS CO-FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS

CONTENTS

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
3. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD, 2007 THROUGH 2009
4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY
5. BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
6. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
7. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009

**Part I: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD**

Did you implement any of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “awarding body” method (as defined in Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programme(s)?

Yes/No: Yes

- If *Yes*, fill in Part I.

I.1 - Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the “awarding body” method from 2007 to 2009

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, enter the share of the overall EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) which was granted in the “awarding body” method (in percentage, no decimal).

- Programme 2007: 100 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method

- Programme 2008: 100 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method

- Programme 2009: 100 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method

I.2 - Calls for proposals

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number of calls for proposals organised for the implementation of the annual EIF programmes in the “awarding body” method.

- Programme 2007: 2 (run jointly with the programme 2008)

- Programme 2008: 2 (run jointly with the programme 2007)

- Programme 2009: 2 (run jointly with the programme 2010)

I.3 - Proposals received, selected and funded after calls for proposals

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL 2007-2009</i>
Proposals received	*	*	**	108 <i>(including the first call for proposals for 2010)</i>
Projects selected	9	19	***	28 <i>(excluding Programme2009)</i> ***
Projects funded	9	19	***	28 <i>(excluding Programme2009)</i> ***

**It was a joint call for proposal and in total 74 proposals were received for both 2007 and 2008 programmes.*

***It was a joint call for proposal with 2010 and in total 38 proposals were received for both programmes.*

**** The process of selection is not finalized yet.*

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for proposals been funded?

Yes/No: Yes

- If *No*, explain why:

I.4 - Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals

Not applicable

I.5 - Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method in the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table I.3)	9	19	*	28* (excluding Programme2009)
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	9	19	*	28* (excluding Programme2009)

** The process of selection is not yet finalized.*

I.6 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

By Priority

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Priority: each of the four Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Priorities)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	9	19	*
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	8	16	*
Priority 2			**
Priority 3			*
Priority 4	1	3	*

* *The process of selection is not yet finalized.*

** *A separate call for proposal for priority 2 has been launched in 2010.*

I.7 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

By Category of Actions

- Only for projects *funded*, only number of projects in each case
- Category of Actions: each of the four Categories, from a) to d), set out in Article 3 of the EIF Council decision (Decision 2007/435/EC)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Categories)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	9	19	*
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	<i>1</i>		*
Category b)	<i>3</i>	<i>11</i>	*
Category c)	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	*
Category d)	<i>1</i>	<i>5</i>	*

** The process of selection is not yet finalized.*

I.8 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

Specific Priorities

- Only for projects *funded*, only *number* of projects in each case
- *Specific Priorities: the five Specific Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)*
- *No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two of the headings listed below)*

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	<i>9</i>	<i>19</i>	*
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>	*
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>3</i>	<i>6</i>	*
Specific Priority 3 only			*
Specific Priority 4 only	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	*
Specific Priority 5 only			*
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities			*
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority			*

** The process of selection is not yet finalized.*

**Part II: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD**

Did you implement any of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “executing body” method (as defined in Article 8 of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programme(s)?

Yes/No: No

- If *No*, do not fill in Part II, but go directly to Part III

**Part III: SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED
IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND
IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
2007 THROUGH 2009**

III.1. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 1 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

The majority of Swedish projects are funded under Priority 1 and addresses empowerment, intercultural dialogue, health, civic education and cooperation. The project owners are primarily public bodies, followed by NGO’s. In 2007 and 2008 six proposals were received from enterprises but none of them had the quality to be approved. The most successful approval rate has the public bodies where about 50% of the applications have been approved for 2007 and 2008 annual programmes. In some cases it has been difficult for some projects to find co-financing, which has an effect specifically on NGO’s. The Programme’s target group is not the same group that gets support from the Swedish government through the social system, which limits the incentive for authorities to get financially engaged in the projects. Many NGO’s are dependent on having a strong partner in order to be able to carry out projects. For the annual programmes 2007 and 2008 most of the applications addressed civic education and intercultural dialogue.

As examples of types of projects within priority 1 are:

- Development of methods for integration of newly arrived based on the participants’ needs and constructive suggestions on activities. Focus has for example been on how Sweden of today was formed.
- Creating opportunities for the target group to get involved in different parts of the civil society.
- Civic education with different set ups (some directed to specific target groups such as women, parents and young people).
- Skill assessment that can lead to vocational validation. It is often combined with studies and training of different sort.

- Several projects address the health of the newly arrived, such as pre natal care for expecting mothers, child care and parental skills. As well as compiling and dissemination of results of health projects.
- Projects aiming at strengthening parents that are living under psychosocial stress and creating methods to help parents and children in their contact with the Swedish system of day care and pre school.

Common tools to carry out the projects are seminars, gatherings, coordination meetings and civic education. According to some of the final reports the meeting between the beneficiaries and the responsible organisations for integration creates a foundation for mutual understanding, cultural insights and knowledge-based development. An important ingredient is the participation and involvement of the beneficiaries and their cultural codes in the projects.

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

III.2. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 2 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Not applicable

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

III.3. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 3 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Not applicable

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

III.4. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 4 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

So far very few of the projects have had transnational components. The few cases we have seen have been based on that the project owner already had established contacts to draw from.

Examples of projects within priority 4 are:

- EIF co-funded a conference during Sweden’s EU presidency in October 2009. Over 130 participants gathered in Malmö for the opening of the Presidency conference ‘Labour Migration and its Development Potential in the Age of Mobility’. Participants from EU Member States, candidate countries, invited third countries and others met for two days to discuss migration issues. On the conference the subjects for discussion included how labour migration to the EU could act as a means to achieve the goals of the Lisbon Strategy and the design of future EU labour migration policy. The second theme of the conference was circular migration and its development potential, that is, how the mobility of migrants back and forth across borders can contribute to development in countries of origin and how positive effects can be maximised.
- Another project had exchanges of best practice and ideas with a Dutch research center working with introduction of third country nationals. The Swedish project gained important insight in different ways of working with health among the target group. Experiences on how to get parents involved in their children’s education and involved in civic education where also shared. Both partners have worked with the same issues but found different solutions so the exchange of ideas and views have brought added value to both organisations.

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

III.5. Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Not applicable

III.6. Summary description of the projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Not applicable

III.7. Referring to Tables I-6, I-7 and I-8, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009

Maximum length: half a page

- There are a lesser number of transnational projects than what has been expected for the first three annual programmes. In order to achieve more proposals there needs to be more work done to facilitate interaction between potential project partners. Due to the late start of the programme and the focus on setting up the system it has not yet been possible to prioritise this work and it reflects in the project proposals received. The distribution of the projects in the actions under priority 1 is satisfactory. A lot of interest in health projects and skill assessments has been seen.
- The participation of the target group has been evident but more work should be done in some projects to get a thorough involvement in all stages of the project cycle.

- Further emphasise on mainstreaming should be done since it varies among projects; then again it is still not a large number of projects approved nor finalised in order to see the final results that can be disseminated and transferred. There is a need to more clearly stress that mechanisms should be in place to incorporate project results and findings in to regular activities and that the planning for this needs to be done from start. For the next call for proposals this will be even more stressed when we are in contact with potential project promoters.

III.8. Referring to Tables II-6, II-7 and II-8, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “executing body” method, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009

Not applicable

III.9. Highlight any other significant change (other than the distribution referred to under points 7 and 8) to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method and in the “executing body” method over the period from 2007 to 2009

Maximum length: half a page

In the “awarding body” method

The quality of the proposals has been improved. The applicants have more understanding of how the Programme works and misinterpretations are not as common as in the start.

A trend is seen in that the budget estimation is too high when they apply and the projects therefore don't use the funds allocated to their project. This continues to be a problem and measures will have to be taken in order to get a better use of the funds.

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

III.10. Description of two “success stories”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009

Maximum length: half a page

The following projects, one from 2007 and one from 2008 programme have interesting results. The later will end in June 2010. These two have in spite of the intensive start of the 2007 and 2008 programmes managed in both reaching results and meeting challenges such as finding participants and coping with changes in personnel.

Doulas (supportes), cultural interpreters and maternity groups (priority 1, action health, 2008 programme):

The NGO *Födelsehuset* (House of birth) had in early 2008 a project where several women were trained in maternity and pregnancy issues in order to support pregnant women in their mother tongue. This initiative was in the application for EIF extended by giving the doulas further training as leaders/facilitators of maternity groups in the child care. Three groups were established in December 2009 for Somali and Arabic speaking moms. The groups are “women-only” in order to have open discussions about body, soul and private issues. A midwife trains the doulas in parental issues so that the future moms have the same access to such information as ethnic Swedes. One important question evoked is the situation of many pregnant women who have been victims of female genital mutilation. The support and help has proven to decrease stress and worry and have proved to be efficient. Only in March 2010 14 doulas were in training and around 30 assignments were carried out were doulas participates before, during or after the delivery. The project participated in the “Integration day conference” of the ESF-Council presenting its working method and has been object of the monitoring visit by the Commission in April 2010. The project has a concrete objective in improving the health of future moms and facilitating the communication with the Swedish society. (See their information in Swedish and other languages

<http://www.fodelsehuset.se/kulturtolk/kulturtolk.htm>)

Intercultural dialogue for sustainable development in the Södertälje municipality (priority 1, action dialogue, 2007 programme): The project has trained seven female third country nationals in job coaching and intercultural dialogue with the help of Manpower. An information kit for coaching and dialogue has been produced. The dialogue has focused on the needs of the women during their first months in Sweden. How do they perceive themselves, their background and their host country? At the same time, how do Manpower and the personnel of the municipality perceive the women? The participants have had 40-50 hours of training. This had led to a deep understanding of their way of life, communication and pathway to working life. The information kit is closely connected to the eleven principles among others basic knowledge, working life, language, history and institutions based on the needs of immigrants. The board of the municipality has been regularly informed and the experiences have been integrated in two other new projects, not funded by EIF. Their beneficiaries, young people and long term unemployed, are working with the information kit. Together with the social services the projects will raise the awareness of dialogue.

III.11. Description of one “failure”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009

Among all the projects funded under the programmes from 2007 to 2009, there may be one project which you would regard as an important “failure”, because it proved impracticable, it did not meet expectations, or any other reason for you to judge, and you think there are lessons to be drawn from its failure.

The project should not be identified (i.e. the name of the project or beneficiaries should not be mentioned).

It is essential that the description of the project, your justification for a “failure”, and the lessons to be drawn can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.

Maximum length: half a page

The project partners were not involved in the project planning and were not really “ready” to take part in the project. They had “forgotten” to involve the target group in the planning and follow up of the project. The target group were just participants in activities without any influence over the projects direction or actions and did not have any real influence over the set up of the project. The selection procedure of participants took much more time and the planned number was not achieved. Furthermore some of the organisations had new

personnel and it created some break in the implementation of the project. The project actors had difficulty in taking into account the regulations of EIF, which led to incomplete payment demands and more time in processing them in ESF-council.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

IV.1. Technical assistance

Please provide a concrete description of the activities implemented under the Technical Assistance measures of the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

Maximum length: 15 lines

The major activities so far:

- Establishing the EIF within Sweden and within the ESF-council.
- Writing multiannual and annual programmes
- Setting up the management and control systems and implementing them.
- Establishing cooperation with the other relevant authorities and the authorities responsible for the other SOLID funds.
- Giving information to potential applicants, arranging call for proposals, selection of projects and monitoring of selected projects.
- Setting up an expert group to help with selection of projects.
- Establishment of routines for declaration and payment.
- Follow up and financial control on projects selected.
- Planning and setting up evaluation routines in order to report and finalise annual programmes.
- Setting up website on information regarding EIF including all documents needed during the project cycle.
- Arranging an annual conference on the programme, as well as informing at other events.

Preparation has started for:

- Presentation of and inclusion of the EIF projects in the project database.
- Setting up a computer based system to aid in the selection process and follow up of projects.

IV.2. Information and Publicity

Please provide a concrete description of the information and publicity activities (as per Articles 33 and 34 of the EIF Implementing Rules) implemented under the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

Describe separately the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority and those by the final beneficiaries.

As part of the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority, please specify the annual information activity which you have organised to present, as of 2008, the launch of the multiannual programme or the achievements of the annual programme(s), as set out in Article 33 (2) a) of the EIF Implementing Rules.

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority

Maximum 15 lines

The information on EIF has been directed both externally and internally in order to establish the fund, mainly through conferences and seminars. Our website (www.esf.se) has been updated with information on EIF (consisting of information to potential applicants, to projects selected and for the general public). To complement the website information materials have been developed to generate interest and explain the programme.

Most of the conferences have been arranged by other organisations and EIF has been invited to present the fund, due to limited resources of the fund it has been an efficient set up. Extra effort has been made to get these opportunities in close proximity to the call for proposals. This is a selection of conferences held:

- 1-2 december 2008 a launch conference of the EIF was held in Uppsala. About 300 participants was there and got information on the fund and about a 100 persons took part in a workshop about the first call for proposals.
- The 5th of November 2009 a conference with 120 participants was arranged together with the other SOLID-funds in order to disseminate information about the program.
- The theme for a one day conference arranged by the ESF council December 17 2009 was Integration. It was a joint venture between the ESF and EIF in order to promote projects on integration. 180 participants from NGO's, local authorities, government and the private sector took part.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

Very few projects have specific web sites set up, though several have information about the project on the main web site of the final beneficiary. Most of them have external activities where they have made the EIF visible, such as meetings and seminars. Some has made guides and other materials for distribution. All approved projects are also invited to go through a one day meeting on how to financial report their projects. It also includes practical examples on how to interpret annex 11 and how to fill in the applications for payment. As part of the training focuses on the visibility of the EIF and all funded projects receive an information kit containing among others a signboard and stickers in order to help with visibility of the EIF.

The Swedish ESF council monitors what is written in the press about ESF and EIF. Some articles on the EIF projects have been written, mostly in the local media.

**Part V: BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF
FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009**

Based on the Commission Decision approving each annual programme and on the information available to the Responsible Authority on the budget implementation of the programmes, please fill in the table below:

Annual Programme	Total EIF contribution to the programme as set in the Commission Decision approving the annual programme Amount (1)	Total EIF contribution <u>committed</u> by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010 Amount (2)	EIF budget implementation rate (EIF Committed/ EIF Available) Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	1 161 802,92	734 396,11	63,21 %
Programme 2008	1 408 301,65	1 196 268,33	84,94%
Programme 2009	1 913 972,37	0	0
TOTAL 2007-2009	4 484 076,94	1 930 664,44	75,12 %

The exchange rate 9,00 has been used to convert Swedish crowns to Euro.
The percentage of the total is based on figures for the annual programmes 2007 and 2008.

<p style="text-align: center;">Part VI: ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009</p>
--

Based on:

- *All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each Annual Programme;*
- *Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority.*

Provide your assessment of the implementation of the annual programmes from 2007 through 2009 for the items listed below.

In each case please explain the reasons for your judgement. If for any item you cannot provide an assessment by June 2010, please answer “Not known by June 2010”.

VI.1. Assessment of the implementation of the 2007 Annual Programme

- 1. Has the 2007 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

15 lines maximum

The 2007 programme has been implemented but not in line with the programme schedule. The national regulation for EIF was approved in January 2009, which enabled the call for proposals for the annual programme 2007 and 2008. The late start of the EIF forced the ESF-Council in having identical programmes for 2007 and 2008. A negative consequence has been the late start of the projects for 2007 programme is that the project period, had to be shortened. In some cases projects had to run over two programmes, which has increased the administration at the RA and made it more complex.

2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2007 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?

15 lines maximum

There have been some problems regarding financial management and interpretation of eligible costs for the projects. To meet this need we have had information meetings on how financial manage projects for all approved projects. In some cases the ESF financial officers have met with specific projects in order to go through the requirements and answer detailed questions.

The implementation rules where new and it took a lot of time to interpret the complex rules some mistakes were made and the applicants suffered from not getting the right information. More information and better quality information has been given to potential applicants for the 2009 and 2010 call for proposals.

Since a lot of effort was put into setting up the systems and doing everything for the first time the implementation of the programme was not as perfected as hoped for.

3. Has a revision of the 2007 programme by the Commission been necessary? If so, what were the main changes?

No.

4. Have you implemented the 2007 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)

15 lines maximum

Projects are divided among all actions, but the budget allocated to the actions is not being used in full (with less than a 10 percent difference from the financial tables of 2007).

- 5. Have the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2007 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - been achieved at the end of this programme?**

15 lines maximum

As outlined in the annual programme for 2007 the Swedish ESF-Council has chosen a holistic approach to the results of EIF, which means that it will be evaluated for the whole programming period. ESF-Council concludes that the indicators for each action are still relevant for EIF and that the projects funded will help achieve the results.

- 6. In the light of the implementation of the 2007 programme, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

15 lines maximum

The 2007 programme has an appropriate distribution between the actions and the actions set out in the programme were appropriate.

VI.2. Assessment of the implementation of the 2008 Annual Programme

- 1. Has the 2008 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

15 lines maximum

The 2008 programme has been implemented but not in line with the programme schedule. The national regulation for EIF was approved in January 2009, which enabled the call for proposals for the 2007 and 2008 annual programmes.

Since it was the first call for proposal of the programme a lot of effort was put into setting up the first structure for the programme and it is likely that some of the projects suffered in quality because of this. More information and better quality information has been given to potential applicants for the 2009 and 2010 call for proposal.

2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2008 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?

15 lines maximum

An encountered problem is that the projects need more time in order to achieve their project plans. There is a risk that some of funding will be not used before the end of June 2010. The measure that we took was to request an extension of the eligibility period of the projects to the Commission.

There have been some problems regarding financial management and interpretation of eligible costs for the projects. To meet this need we have had information meetings on how financial manage projects for all approved projects. In some cases the ESF financial officers have met with specific projects in order to go through the requirements and answer detailed questions.

3. Has a revision of the 2008 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what were/are the main changes?

No

4. Have you implemented the 2008 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved/to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)

15 lines maximum

We have had proposals in priority one and four, and among each of the actions, but not all of the approved funding will be used.

5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2008 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - to be achieved at the end of this programme?

15 lines maximum

As outlined in the annual programme for 2008 the Swedish ESF-Council has chosen a holistic approach to the results of EIF and the indicators will be reported at the end of the programming period.

ESF-Council concludes that the indicators for each action are still relevant for EIF and that the amount of projects funded will help achieve the results.

6. In the light of the implementation of the 2008 programme, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?

15 lines maximum

The 2008 programme has a good distribution between the actions. An earlier information campaign might have increased the amount of proposals and a better quality of proposals.

We have been too optimistic regarding the interest of transnational projects. Our experience is that there is not enough time and “meeting points” for projects to easily get in contact with each other in order to facilitate transnational cooperation. The potential applicants are dependent on contacts that they already have. We are working on finding methods in getting more applicants to apply for transnational projects.

VI.3. Assessment of the implementation of the 2009 Annual Programme

- 1. Has the 2009 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

15 lines maximum

The 2009 and 2010 programmes were launched at the same time in order to compensate for earlier delay. The schedule is that the projects will be approved throughout the summer. From the proposals received it is still very few projects that have transnational activities. It is too early to go into more details on how the outcome will be.

We expect to be in phase with the programme schedule in 2011.

- 2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2009 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?**

15 lines maximum

Not known by June 2010

- 3. Has a revision of the 2009 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what are the main changes?**

15 lines maximum

Not known by June 2010

4. Do you expect to fully implement the 2009 programme (the case being, the revised programme)? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)

15 lines maximum

Not known by June 2010

5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2009 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission – to be achieved at the end of this programme?

15 lines maximum

Not known by June 2010

6. In the light of the implementation of the 2009 programme to date, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?

15 lines maximum

Not known by June 2010

VI.4. The Management and Control System of the EIF programmes and the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007 through 2009

Based on:

- All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each Annual Programme 2007 through 2009;
- The Management and Control system of the EIF in your Member State;
- Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority.

Provide your assessment for the following items. Please explain the reasons for your judgement.

- 1. Has the Management and Control System of the EIF, which you designed in 2007-8, been efficient for the implementation of the annual programmes so far?**

Half a page maximum

In August 2008 and April 2010 the EIF had monitoring visits from the Commission. Both visits had meetings with the responsible authorities and the second one included project visits. The first monitoring visit focused on the control and management system. It was a very constructive meeting and it has helped the ESF-Council in formulating and improving several parts of the management and control system. Recommendations from the second visit has not been received.

The Swedish auditing authority has approved the system, but we await the formal written documents to certify that.

Coordination of the management and control system with the other SOLID funds might have lead to more efficiency, since lessons from previous programmes could have been learnt.

2. Please list the changes you have made in the Management and Control System of the European Integration Fund which you designed in 2007-8, bearing in mind the experiences gained/ lessons learned during the implementation of the annual programmes 2007 - 2009

Half a page maximum

ESF-Council still awaits the formal documents for compliance, but we work according to the Management and Control System sent to the Commission.

In 2010 some smaller changes in division of duties between the central and regional office of ESF-Council has been carried out and everyone that works with the fund on a daily basis is now working from the regional office (but at a national level). This change has been made in order to make the work and implementation of the fund more efficient. Just as stated in the Management and Control System the tasks relating to call for proposals, selection and follow up of projects of the EIF are carried out by personnel at the regional office of Stockholm. The central office contributes with the certifying and monitoring tasks as well as information and communication. The regional office is directly under the Director General, thus separated from the certifying authority.

Some changes are planned in order to shorten the selection procedure. These can effect the management and control system. As soon as compliance is formally received a follow up of the Management and Control systems will be carried out in order to see if it needs revision. If a revision is needed a new version will be submitted to the Commission when we present the final report for the annual programme 2007.

**Part VII: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE
AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF
PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009**

In case you had recourse to an external expertise for other parts of this report:

This part must always be filled in by the Responsible Authority itself

VII.1. What is your overall assessment of the EIF implementation in your Member State from 2007 to 2009?

1 page maximum

The information given at two meetings with the European Commission (June 2008 and April 2010) the Swedish ESF-Council has underlined the late implementation of the programme, which of course has created problems. 2008 was dedicated to finalising the multi-annual and annual programmes of 2007-2008 as well as the control and management systems. At the time of the call for proposals more than one year had gone in order to set up the foundation of the programme.

Time needs to be allocated to get the programme started without jeopardising the implementation of the first call for proposals; more flexibility is needed in order to be able to tackle with unexpected delays and problems.

The complexity of the program and its setup has made implementation less efficient than it could have been if a different architecture of the programme would have been chosen.

VII.2. On the basis of the information available to you by 30 June 2010, please provide your preliminary assessment in relation to the following aspects of the European Integration Fund in your Member State from 2007 to 2009

* Relevance of the EIF programme's priorities and actions to your national situation

Please describe how relevant the programme's priorities and actions are overall to the problems and needs identified in your Member State. Has there been an evolution in your Member State which required a reshaping of the intervention?

15 lines maximum

No reshaping is needed. The programmes priorities and actions are still relevant. Furthermore the national integration policy is under revision which makes the EIF projects an important tool in the process. For example, the Swedish government issued a strategy for empowerment (Skr 2008/09:24) in September 2008 which in all is in agreement with the priorities of the programme.

* Effectiveness of the programme

Please highlight the key results of your programme so far and the extent to which the strategy set out in your multiannual programme strategy has been implemented. Are the results of the intervention (as far as they are known by 30 June 2010) consistent with your objectives?

15 lines maximum

The project applications for the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes are in agreement of the programme and will therefore contribute to the overall programme objectives.

If by effectiveness one means "setting right targets in order to achieve a special effect" the late start of programme makes it difficult to make any sort of qualitative evaluation at the moment. The initial effects are being noticed in the internal organisation of the project itself, its participants and participating actors but it is too soon to draw any conclusions on a larger scale since very few projects are finalised as of today. The effect can be measured or detected on an overall level in the 2012 evaluation.

* Efficiency of the programme

Please estimate the cost of the management of the European Integration Fund so far and whether in your opinion the programme's objectives are being developed in accordance with the original planning at a reasonable cost.

15 lines maximum

The management of EIF has to be related to the initial assignment of Swedish ESF-Council. In 2007 the majority of council employees were dedicated in ending the programmes of 2000-2006 and preparing the launch of the 2007-2013 period. The work with EIF started in late 2007 by the writing of the programmes. Even with lots of experience from the ESF it was an extensive task to implement the fund. So the efficiency of the implementation was not maximal but optimal. In May 2010 more than 10 persons are partly involved in EIF compared to one in 2008. The administration of this fund requires a lot of personnel in order to be carried out (especially considering the relatively small amount of funds available); unfortunately a lot of the hours are spent on the framework and less on the projects work and the scope of the fund.

The Swedish auditing authority stated in its report (November 2009) that the selection procedure of EIF is functioning well but needs further improvements. The document for selection has a few unanswered questions of minor detail (such as initials of the responsible coordinator, confirmation of responsible manager of the applicant and other formalities). In one case the reason for non-admissability was considered weak. The Swedish ESF-Council answered the report and has listed the measures taken.

In April 2010 the EIF has monitoring visits from the Commission. Recommendations from the visit has not been recieved.

* Complementarity

Please explain how you ensured complementarity with your nationally funded programmes in the area of intervention of the EIF, on the one hand, and with other EC financial instruments, on the other hand, in particular the European Refugee Fund and the European Social Fund. Did you encounter any difficulty in this respect and, if so, what measures did you take?

15 lines maximum

European Social Fund

EIF has always been a part of the ESF programme unit of national level and of the regional ESF unit since 2008, which has contributed in distinguishing the special characteristics of both programmes and in avoiding double financing. The thematic work of the Swedish ESF council will also include success stories from EIF, the two relevant thematic projects are the regional *Newly arrived* and the national *Integration in working life*. EIF is presented with ESF and other relevant programmes of the ESF-Council in all external activities. In theory projects from EIF and ESF could have complimented each other well but in the complexity of the eligibility rules for EIF has made it a hard sell to the project promoters.

The SOLID Funds

Since 2008 regular meetings has been held between the SOLID funds and programming issues are discussed on a regular basis. Meetings are held before every SOLID committee and the national partnership as well as on an ad hoc basis depending on need and current issues. Contacts between programme officers are taken through the application process in order to exchange information on applicants and to avoid double financing between ERF and EIF. A problem seen is that there could have been more efficient to have had less strict target groups of the ERF and the EIF because it can cause problems setting up projects that have to be divided into different programmes even if the information and education could and should been the same for both groups.

Since it is three authorities responsible for the four SOLID funds in Sweden it would help if we had three seats for the Swedish delegation at the SOLID committee meetings. As it is now it is hard for all funds / authorities to be able to take part in the discussions.

Meetings with the Ministry of Integration is held on a regular basis, in order to keep both parties informed of the progress of the fund as well as information on current issues within the Ministry. In some cases specific projects are discussed. Three meetings have been held with the *Swedish public Employment Services*

because of their recent take-over of newly arrived refugees from the municipalities; more cooperation in for example programming is foreseen.

So far we have not seen any problems regarding double financing since the numbers of projects are few and that we have a good network for exchange of information with different actors in the field. We monitor the issue and if a need arises we are ready to take appropriate action.

* Added value

Please explain how you perceive the EIF added value in your Member State in comparison with existing national programmes/policies/budget, and in relation to other EC financial instruments, in the area of intervention of the EIF.

15 lines maximum

The target group is a group not often included in activities connected to integration so it is good that there are specific funds set aside for this group and its purpose. There is a policy change in Sweden allowing for labour migration so there will be larger groups of third country nationals in the future and the project results can serve as good practice in i.e. how civic education can be organised.

The most relevant added value is the construction of the EIF with a direct connection to the European integration principles and the highlighting of the beneficiaries (third country citizens). Even though the group is not as quantitatively high in Sweden compared to France or Germany, its needs are important to highlight and contributes to whether the measures should be taken on national level in order to benefit the EIF target group.

As stressed earlier, the effects of the projects - when analysed in 2012 - will give more insight if EIF did enhance the integration of the beneficiaries or affected the national policy.

VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement

In total 2-3 pages maximum

For the coming programming period **do not have annual programmes**. Almost all problems that we see with implementing arise from this set up. A stressed

start often causes problems that you have to address later on which means that not only do you have to deal with current tasks but you also have to deal with issues in the past. While doing that the number of programs that are active expands and so does the tasks involved with writing, operating and closing them. This creates a huge workload and takes away focus from the projects work and their results, best practice and mainstreaming.

Generally the standpoint taken by ESF-Council is the construction of EIF is too detailed. Less detailed management of eligible cost and thematic categories of the fund is recommended. It is more constructive underlining European key documents and strategic references rather than thematic categories containing several subcategories, priorities and special actions. A programme needs to be set up in a way that makes it “easy” to explain to the final beneficiaries. A broader definition of the target group would also be helpful in implementing a successful programme.

The detailed budget of projects and the heavy administration of EIF from the Commission are at odds with how the management of the Structural Funds has been developed for the current programming period: less regulation from the Commission, and more focus on Member State management and implementation. We would like to see EIF develop in line with these changes.

Under this item please specify in particular:

** Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (EIF basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the annual programming exercise in general?*

Half a page maximum

- The programme structure is far too complicated. We can not see that the annual programmes serves a purpose since the results of the projects should be seen over the whole programme period. The set up is vulnerable since a delay in programming affects the potential project owners and any adjustments requires a lot of administration on the part of the managing authorities as well as by the Commission. The current system of multiannual and annual programmes needs to be reformed to one multiannual program. It would increase efficiency and effectiveness of the funds. Due to the late start we were forced to have joint call for proposals of two annual programmes and it is not possible to transfer money between programmes and there is no flexibility for the projects if

unforeseen things happens or if we do not approve projects as fast as hoped for. This gives EIF a disadvantage compared to other programmes.

- Furthermore, the set up with annual programmes makes the reporting very heavy on the ESF-Council. This draws time and resources that could have been spent on for example mainstreaming results, information to potential project owners .
- The programming is extensive and since several annual programmes are running at the same time it is a daunting task to keep all administrative and programming actions in mind. The complexity should have been foreseen and now with lessons learned never be repeated again. The benefits of having a programme such as EIF are at risk of being buried under layers of heavy administration.
- Since the administrative operating expense for the EIF is extensive, the technical assistance should at least be maintained at 7 percent throughout the whole programme period, and should possibly be even higher.

** Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (EIF basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the implementation of the actions / projects and the control mechanisms on the actions/ projects?*

Half a page maximum

- The Eligibility rules needs to be simplified in line with the European Social Fund. The work regarding simplifications of annex 11 in the implementing rules initiated by the Commission is greatly anticipated. We foresee that this current system focus too much on details and the detailed monitoring in order to assured that the complex eligibility rules are implemented can hamper the effectiveness of the projects.
- A wider scope regarding the SOLID target groups would increase the possibility for more mainstreaming.
- Having fewer categories of action in order to permit the project applicants to form their ideas and views within the scope of the programme.

- The Commission has published a manual for eligibility rules but its status is unclear. It would be of great help if the interpretations made in the manual can be both consistent and ready for implementation.
- The Commission has been working on a manual to help the Member States prepare for evaluation of the Funds. This manual has still not been presented, and even though the first evaluation report is not due until 2012, the guidance is needed already. To be able to present a complete evaluation, preparations must be made at the stage of programme and project planning. Therefore, the need for this manual is urgent.
- The co-financing of the priority regarding indicators for integration policy is maximum 50 percent. This has created difficulties for public institutions such as universities and colleges, because they cannot finance their indirect cost through EIF funding.
- The co-financing in other priorities creates difficulties for the representatives for the target groups such as NGOs or organisations from the social economy. There is therefore a risk that EIF loses relevant un-traditional actors with innovative ideas. Generally it is difficult to find co-financing for any EU fund, but in the case of EIF not even the state allowance giving to participants (unemployed, newly arrived etc) is eligible.
- The payment request could be confirmed by accumulated financial data and documents rather than invoices - more focus on project visits rather than on desk control.

** Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in terms of the guidance and support by the Commission to the Member States on the implementation of the programming exercise and the management and control system?*

Half a page maximum

- A guide for management and control system with clear indications of what the Commission requests and what the Commission *recommends* in order to facilitate the implementation.

- A guide on how to close the annual programmes. It is not completely clear in the rules and templates on how the actions of the Responsible Authority, Certifying Authority are in relation to each other. A schematic model of how the set up is thought to work would be helpful.
- When revising the templates in the implementation rules it would be good to have them in a format that allows us to use them directly, that is to be able to fill in the templates in Excel or word.

End of the report